

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUN 18 2007

Response to Final Office Action  
Docket No. A0988  
Attorney Docket No. 022.0522.US.UTL

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending. Claims 7, 12, 13, 15, 19, 23-25, and 28 have been amended. No new matter has been entered. Claims 1-35 remain in the application. The claim amendments present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal. 37 CFR 1.116(b)(2). Applicant requests entry of the claim amendments.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 20, 22-28, 30-33, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,832,244, issued to Raghunandan ("Raghunandan") in view of Bill Dyszel, 1999 Publishing, Wiley Publishing, Inc. ("Dyszel"). Applicant traverses the rejection.

Initially, the examiner must show some teaching or suggestion to combine references that supports their use in combination. *See, Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refracs., Inc.*, 776 F.2d 281, 227 USPQ 657 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The absence of a suggestion to combine is dispositive in an obviousness determination. *McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1339, 60 USPQ2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Bambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.*, 110 F.3d 1573, 42 USPQ2d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1997). However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would not have been motivated or have had a reason to combine Raghunandan and Dyszel.

Raghunandan discloses a graphical email content analyzer and prioritizer in an email system that includes *inter alia* means for identifying or prioritizing received email messages and displaying the parameter values of the messages in graphical form using graphical images (Abstract). The header and body of each email are parsed to respectively extract information relating to the subject, sender, date, domain, and so forth, and keywords or phrases (Col. 6, lines 35-40 and 49-56). The parsed emails are identified based on combinations of various parameters and, after identification, emails of the same type are grouped together and sequenced by priority (Col. 6, lines 54-60). The emails are then displayed by a graphical output generator, which converts each email into a graphical symbol, such as a button (Col. 6, lines 61-64). The graphical symbols are selected based

Response to Final Office Action  
Docket No. A0988  
Attorney Docket No. 022.0522.US.UTL

on a combination of colors, symbols, and letters (Col. 7, lines 2-5).

Dyszal discloses category and layout email message grouping and display. Dyszel uses a Group By dialog box to group user selected listings. A grouped view shows the names of the columns that are used to create the group view.

- 5 Grouping is a way to manage all Outlook items, especially contacts. A user can flag contacts and create reminders. A reminder pops up on the appointed date and prompts the user to make a call (pages 84, 85, 156, and 158).

- Claims 1, 8, and 16, on the other hand, recite a plurality of category-specific arrangements of e-mail messages in differing levels of granularity that are  
10 specific to the categories and subcategories to which the e-mail messages are assigned, specifying a plurality of display-specific arrangements of e-mail messages in differing levels of granularity that are specific to the display to which the e-mail messages are assigned, and specifying a plurality of layouts of the category-specific arrangements and the display-specific arrangements that are  
15 specific to the display upon which the e-mail messages are displayed. Such limitations are neither taught nor suggested by the Raghunandan-Dyszal combination. The Raghunandan-Dyszal combination does not allow either display-specific arrangements in differing levels of granularity or a plurality of layouts of category-specific arrangements and display-specific arrangements that  
20 are specific to the display upon which the e-mail messages are displayed, per Claims 1, 8, and 16.

- Claims 1, 8, and 16 further recite displaying each of the email messages in accordance with the display specification, using the category-specific arrangement and the display-specific arrangement for the category or subcategory  
25 to which the e-mail is assigned, and using the layout for the display upon which the e-mail message is displayed. Raghunandan discloses multiple types of email classifications, including sender names, sender domain, email subject, contained keywords, email size, email attachments, and date sent or received (Col. 8, lines 55-67). Dyszel permits specification of categories and shunting of messages into  
30 these categories. However, the Raghunandan-Dyszal combination fails to teach or

Response to Final Office Action  
Docket No. A0988  
Attorney Docket No. 022.0522.US.UTL

suggest differing levels of granularity or a plurality of layouts of category-specific arrangements and display-specific arrangements that are specific to the display upon which the e-mail messages are displayed, per Claims 1, 8, and 16.

Consequently, the Raghunandan-Dyszel combination neither teaches nor  
5 suggests the claimed limitations as recited in Claims 1, 8, and 16, and one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would not be motivated or have a reason to combine the Raghunandan and Dyszel references.

Claims 2, 5, 7, 23, 26-28, and 30 are dependent on Claim 1, and are patentable for the above-stated reasons and as further distinguishable by the  
10 limitations therein. Claims 9, 12, 14, 15, 24, 31, 32, 33, and 35 are dependent on Claim 8, and are patentable for the above-stated reasons and as further distinguishable by the limitations therein. Finally, Claims 17, 20, 22, and 25 are dependent on Claim 16, and are patentable for the above-stated reasons and as further distinguished by the limitations therein. Withdrawal of rejection under 35  
15 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 21, 29, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Raghunandan in view of Dyszel.

Claims 3, 4, 6, and 29 are dependent on Claim 1, and are patentable for the reasons stated above with respect to the obviousness rejection and as further  
20 distinguished by the limitations therein. Claims 10, 11, and 13 are dependent on Claim 8, and are patentable for the reasons stated above with respect to the obviousness rejection and as further distinguishable by the limitations therein. Finally, Claims 18, 19, and 21, are dependent on Claim 16, and are patentable for the reasons stated above with respect to the obviousness rejection and as further  
25 distinguishable by the limitations therein. A *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been shown. Withdrawal of rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed by the applicant and is considered to be no more pertinent than the prior art references  
30 already applied.

Response to Final Office Action  
Docket No. A0988  
Attorney Docket No. 022.0522.US.UTL

Claims 1-35 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Entry of the foregoing amendments is requested. Reconsideration of the claims, withdrawal of the finality of the Office action and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. Please contact the undersigned at (206) 381-3900 regarding any questions or  
5 concerns associated with the present matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 18, 2007

By: 

Patrick J.S. Inoue, Esq.  
Reg. No. 40,297

10

Cascadia Intellectual Property  
500 Union Street, Suite 1005  
Seattle, WA 98101

Telephone: (206) 381-3900  
Facsimile: (206) 381-3999

15

Final OA Resp